


# INFANTS-BAPTISM

Disproved: 

AND

Believers Baptism proved.

OR, An

# A N S W E R

To several Arguments propounded

in a paper by Mr. *Alexander Kellie*, Minister at *Giles Cripple Gate London*, and sent to Mr. *Jeremiah Ives* of the said P A R I S H.

And is now published for the general information of all, but particularly for the satisfaction of many of the Inhabitants of the said P A R I S H, who have desired it.

Wherein

The ARGUMENTS for Infant-Baptism are examined and disproved.

By the said *Jeremiah Ives*.

*Jer Ives*

Prov. 18.17. He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbour comes and searcheth him.

Job 6.25. How forcible are right words? but what do your arguings reprove?

Prov. 23.23. Buy the truth, but sell it not.

Luke 7. 30. But the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him.

Printed at London for Richard Moore, and are to be sold at the seven Stars in Paul's Church-yard near the great North door, 1655.







## To the READER.

Reader,

**I** hose men of Berea, *Act. 17. 11.*  
were counted more noble then they of  
Thessalonica, because they would  
take nothing upon trust that the Apos-  
tles said, but scanned the Scripture  
daily to see if what They said were  
so; How ignoble should we be in this  
Age, (wherein men are much more  
divided in matters of Religion, then they were in the A-  
postles times, and wherein our Teachers themselves are  
contradictious one to another, in many of the great con-  
cernments of Religion) if we should receive any thing  
from them without diligent search into the Word of God, to  
see if it be true or no? sith Solomon makes this a distin-  
guishing Character between a wise Man and a Fool, *Prov.*  
*14. 15.* The simple believeth every word, but the wise  
man looks well to his goings. Neither let a man think  
that his looking back to the ancient Fathers, and his  
searching

searching of them, and reading them, will much help in the midst of these Religious disorders, because they were in many things as much contradictory to the Truth and one another, as any in these times, as for instance: Hierome and Chrysostome deny Original-sin in the sense it is now maintained. Augustine taught, That the Lord's Supper should be given to Infants, in his fifth Book of Hypognosticks. Justin Martyr against Triphon, saith, God at first gave the Sun to be adored. Origen held the Salvation of all both wicked men and devils. The Bishops of the East and West Churches opposed one another in the Doctrine of the Deity of Christ, in the time of Constantius Son to Constantius Magnus. And long after, Socrates, Lib. 1. Chap. 29 and Chrysostome, said, That Saint Paul spake against Truth and Reason in allowing second Marriages. See Moulin's Defence, p. 137, 138. By all this you may see that we have great cause to search the Scripture, and not to follow the Fathers, or any, but wherein they followed Christ. And we may likewise understand, that that which the World now calls, The Christian Religion, is like the Weather-beaten Bark at Athens, that had been so often mended and riged, that it was hard to say, whether it retained any of its old materials, onely it retained its old Name. The like may be said of Religion, as it is commonly profess'd in the world by the generality of men, that it hath been so often mended with the new state of mens own inventions that if we look into the Word of God, and compare the state of the Christian Religion in the Apostles times, to the common Religion that is profess'd now in the Nation, and we shall finde nothing but the name of it; the name of Believing, the name of Churches, the name of  
Bap.

Baptism, the name of Ministers of the Gospel, the name of the Lord's Supper, the name of Christians, &c. How mightily then doth it concern us all, to search the Word of God which is a Light to us in this dark Day, and is able to lead us through all the Mists of the Mystery of Iniquity, and to set our feet in a fair path, where we may walk without stumbling?

But if you shall say, Have not our learned Men undertaken to reform Religion by the Word of God, and cannot they as soon hit the right way through these many wayes, as we?

I answer, It is one thing, what they can do; and another thing, what they will do: considering, how much the most part of them are taken with the love of this present World, and the pride of life, which stops them from laying aside any error that they have preached & practised, lest it should reflect either upon their profits on the one hand, or their credit and learning on the other, as some of the Bishops said in the Council of Trent, That the School men were like Astronomers, which did feign Eccentricks, and Epicycles to save the Phenomina, though they knew there were no such thing. In like manner, as Sir Francis Bacon well observes in his *Essaies of Superstition*, p. 97, 98. The School-men (saith he) have framed a number of subtil and intricate *Axioms* and *Theorems* to save the practise of the Church. I shall therefore intreat the Reader, to see if the Profit of this World, and the Credit of the Learned, doth not engage them to do so in the present controversie of Infants-Baptism, and whether it doth not savour more of the spirit of the forenamed Bishops in the Council of Trent, then of the self-denying spirit that was Christ and his Apostles. For this end, that thou maist

179

try all things, and hold fast the best, I have put forth this  
ensuing Controversie, which at first was private at Mr.  
Kellie's own House, and afterward, according to a promise  
then made, he did send me in a Paper, not only the Ar-  
guments that he laid down then, but also some others that  
he had not then time to propose; all which are particularly  
examined, and the Scriptures relating to them, seriously  
weighed and considered: and therefore, if by what is herein  
written, there be any discovery of the Truth on either side,  
receiveth it and embrace it with readiness of minde; and  
with the like readiness let thy heart be lifted to give God  
the Glory: which is all that is desired from him that is  
'ready to serve thee in the Gospel of Christ,

From my House in Red-Crofts.  
Street, at the corner of the New.  
Street, this 16 of August, 1655.

*Jer. Ives.*



Infant





# Infants-Baptism

*Disproved.*

IN ANSWER TO  
M<sup>r</sup> ALEXANDER KELLIE

His severall *Arguments* levied in  
Defence of it.

*Together with the proof of the lawfullnesse*

# Believers-Baptism.

SIR,



I HAVE received a Paper from you,  
wherein you use your best indeavour  
to prove that Infants ought to be  
Baptized: Which Proposition you  
say you began to prove at a Meeting at your house,  
July 10. 1655. in the forenoon.

B

Whether

## 2 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

Whether you did not at that time, doe like the Builder that Christ speaks of, *Luke 14. 28, 29, 30. viz.* begin to doe that that you were never able to finish, I shall not now determine, but leave it to the Reader to judge, when he shall survey your Arguments, with the Answers to them.

Your first stone that you lay in this building, or Argument that you bring to prove Infants ought to be Baptized, is,

*Mr. Kellie's first Argument.*

**I**F all Nations are commanded to be baptized, then Infants are commanded to be baptized.  
But all Nations are commanded to be baptized.  
Ergo, Infants are commanded to be baptized.

*Mr. Ioe's Answer.*

**I** Doe first deny the major Proposition, because that in many places of Scripture, the word *all Nations* is used, where Infants are not included; as *Psal. 72. 17. All Nations shall call him blessed. Deut. 29. 24. All Nations shall say, wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this Land? Mark 11. 17. Is it not written (saith Christ) that my house shall be called of all Nations, the house of prayer? Psal. 118. 10. All Nations compassed me about, but in the name of the Lord will I destroy them. And so, Mat. 23. 12. All Nations shall call you blessed. And the very place upon which you frame your Argument, is enough, if there were no more, *Mat. 28. 19. where Christ bids his Disciples to Goe and teach all**



all Nations, &c. I would ask any man that knowes what an Argument is, whether by your Rule of reasoning ( viz. All Nations are commanded to be baptized, therefore Infants ) I may not as well say, The Disciples were commanded to teach all Nations, therefore they were commanded to teach Infants of eight dayes old?

And again, the Disciples were commanded to teach them ( to wit, the Nations, according to our Translation ) *all things that Christ commanded his Disciples to doe.* Now the Disciples were commanded to break bread, and drink wine, in remembrance of the body and blood of the Lord, *Mat. 26. 27.* And they were commanded to wash one anothers feet, *John 13. 14.* and many other things. Now may I not as well say, That Infants were commanded these things, as well as baptism, since, as the 19 Verse saith, *Baptize them,* the 20 Verse saith, *Teaching them to observe all things that I, ( viz. Christ ) have commanded you.*

And again, May I not as well say, from the fore cited Scriptures, because the *Psalms* saith, all Nations shall call Christ blessed, that Infants in the Cradle, at eight dayes old, shall call him blessed? And because all Nations shall say, wherefore hath God done this to Israel? therefore Infants of eight dayes old shall say so? And because that Christ saith that his fathers house shall be called of all Nations a house of prayer, that therefore Infants of eight dayes old are commanded to call it so? And because *David* saith, all Nations compassed him about, therefore Infants of eight dayes old compassed him about? And because

#### 4 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

it's prophesied that all Nations shall call *Israel* blessed, therefore Infants of eight dayes old shall call them blessed? I say, May I not as well reason thus, as you may reason, *If all Nations may be baptized, Infants may?*

2 I yet Answer further, as before at our meeting, That this Argument pleads as much for the baptizing of all *Turks* and *Insidells*, because, as *Turks* and *Insidells*, they are a part of all Nations, though they never believe in Christ; and by this rule, the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. might have desired baptism, although he had never believed in Christ, because he was of some one Nation, or other; which is contrary, I presume, to your own opinion, and to the opinion of the Church of *England*, who will not baptize a *Turk* or an *Indian*, unless he convert and professe Christ. But may not the *Turk* or *Indian*, if he should be denied baptism, take up your Argument, and say, If all Nations may be baptized, then we may be baptized: But all Nations may be baptized; Therefore we may. See therefore how this Argument doth interfere with your owne practice.

3 Again, You seem to plead for the baptism of believers Children onely, but your Argument pleads for unbelievers Children, as much or more then believers; for if that believers Children must be baptized because they are a part of Nations, who sees not but by the same rule unbelievers Children may be baptized, because they are a greater part of the Nations, then the Children of believers.

I Answer

*Infants-Baptism disproved.*

5

I Answer to your minor Proposition, as before at your house, That it's a Command for believers and Disciples of Christ, that they should be baptized, and not for all the Nations, as appears by the Originall word, which is *μαθητευαν*, *make Disciples*, *καταλιποντες αυτους*, *baptizing THEM*, and not the Nations, which you could not deny; which made way for your second Argument, which was to prove that Infants were Disciples.

*Mr. Kellie's second Argument.*

**A**LL that are taught of God, are Disciples.  
But the Infants of Gods people are taught of God. Ergo.  
They are Disciples.

*Mr. Iwe's Answer.*

**I** Answer, first, by distinguishing of the Term, *Taught*, in the major Proposition. If by *Taught* you mean as the Prophet *Jeremiah* doth, *Chap. 32. 33.* where it's said, *God taught them, but they refused to receive Instruction*; then I deny the major, for those that refused to receive instruction, were not Disciples, though they were taught.

But secondly, If by *Taught*, you mean, taught so as to receive instruction, and learn; then I deny the minor, for that Infants at eight dayes old are not taught, neither doe they receive instruction, or learn. To prove this, you bring *Isa. 54. 13.* where it's said, *All thy Children shall be taught of God.*

*Answer,*

6 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

Answer, This doth no more prove that infants in the Cradle of eight dayes old, were taught and learned, then the Command the Disciples had to teach all Nations, proves that they taught infants of eight dayes old, and that they learned instruction.

2 This is a Propheſie that all *Iſraels* Children ſhould be taught of God, and not a Propheſie that they ſhould all be taught ſo as to learn, in your ſence, which is the thing you are to prove; for if they ſhould all be ſo taught, then they ſhould all of them be ſaved.

3 If you ſhall ſay the Propheſie reſpects the believers Children, whether *Jewes* or *Gentiles*, that they ſhall be all taught, &c. yet it doth not ſay they ſhall be taught in their Cradle, or at eight dayes old; which you muſt prove, becauſe you ſay infants are Diſciples.

4 How ſoon doe you loſe the tearms of the Proposition! You are to prove *Infants* are taught, and you bring a Text that ſpeaks of *Children*; as though there were no Children but infant-children: Whereas indeed, the Scripture tells us of all *Abrahams* Children, that were ſo by believing, and not by virtue of their carnall diſcent from *Abraham*, Gal. 3. 7.

You further goe on, to prove that this Teaching is to be underſtood of infants, and that it's a teaching by which they learn, and are made Diſciples, by the Argument that you uſed at your houſe, which is the ſame in your Paper.

Mr. Kellie.

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hey that are inwardly and effectually taught,  
are taught, and learne :

But infants according to this Scripture (Iſa. 54.  
13.) are inwardly and effectually taught.  
Ergo. They are taught, and learn.

Mr. Iwe's.

**I**nſwer, by denying the minor, to wit, That  
infants are inwardly and effectually taught,  
according to that Scripture.

For firſt, The word *infants* is not in the Text;  
which is the term of the minor Proposition.

2 If by all thy Children ſhall be taught of God, the  
meaning ſhould be, as you ſay, that the naturall  
ſeed of the believers bodies ſhould be all taught  
of God inwardly and effectually in their infancy;  
then to what purpoſe doe you teach them to be  
converted when they come to years?

3 If all the naturall Children of believers be  
inwardly and effectually taught of God, then  
you muſt hold falling from grace totally and fi-  
nally, or elſe conclude that all the naturall Chil-  
dren of believers ſhall be all ſaved: For what is  
it to be inwardly and effectually taught; but to  
be really and truly Regenerated?

You goe on to prove the minor, (*viz.*) That  
all believers infants are inwardly and effectually  
taught; thus.

Mr. Kellie.



Mr. Kellie.

**I**f infants were not inwardly and effectually taught, (you say) there were no hope of salvation in their death:

But there is hope (say you) of salvation in their death. Ergo.

They are inwardly and effectually taught.

Mr. Ive's.

**I** Answer, first, You leave out the term ALL, and put your Argument into indefinite terms: But I presume by *infants* you mean all the naturall seed of believers, according to your practice in baptizing all of them that you call so.

2. But I shall answer further, by denying the major, which is, *That if infants were not inwardly and effectually taught, there were no hope of salvation in their death:* For first, there was hope of the salvation of those Children with whom the Lord had not SPOKEN, nor to whom he had not given his Lawes, *Deut. 10. 1, 2.* But if they had been inwardly and effectually taught, then the Lord must needs have spoken with them; and if they were taught, it must be in Gods Law; but it is said of those Children, *That God had not spoke with them.*

3. Again, We have great hope of the salvation of infants, because they are made righteous by Jesus Christ, *Rom. 5. 18, 19.* though they should



should not know this by an inward and effectual Teaching.

Also the Scripture saith, *That the Child shall not bear the sin of the father*, and it hath committed in its infancy no sin of its owne, what therefore should hinder us from hoping that they shall be all saved, if they die in their infancy, although they are not taught inwardly and effectually.

4 But last of all, it's a fiction of your own brain to say, *Infants are inwardly and effectually taught*, or else there is no hope of their salvation, because there is not one word of God for to justifie such a saying in the whole Bible.

But yet you adventure to bring that Text, *1 Thess. 4. 13.* where the Apostle adviseth, that the brethren would not sorrow as those that have no hope, because that there shall be a resurrection, which some did not hope for at the death of their friends, which made their sorrow the more intemperate. But now that I may have hope of the salvation of my Children at the resurrection, although I should not believe that unwritten Proposition, to wit, *That in their infancy they are effectually taught*, appears, because of the Text you so much urge in favour to your Baby-baptism, *Mat. 19. 14.* where Christ bids the Disciples suffer little Children to come to him, because of such is the Kingdome of Heaven. So that the Kingdome of Heaven belonged to infants before they had so much as been with Christ, or before he had actually blessed them.

But you proceed to prove the minor Proposition, *That Children must either be inwardly and ef-*

10 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

*fectually taught, or else there is no hope of salvation in their death; thus.*

*Mr. Kellie.*

**W***ithout the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, which is eternall life, there is no hope of salvation.*

*But without the inward and effectual teaching of God in infants; there is no knowledge of God in Christ. Ergo.*

*Without the inward and effectual teaching of God, there is no hope of the salvation of infants.*

*Mr. Ives.*

**Y***ou left out the term* *Infants* *in your major Proposition, by which your Argument becomes fallacious, because it's a term that is afterwards inserted, both in your minor, and conclusion; which if you had played the part of an honest Logician, you should have inserted it in your major, and then it would have run thus,* *Without the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, which is eternall life, there is no hope of salvation for infants; then I would have denied the major, and that because there is not one word of God for such a Proposition;*

*2 God said he would have pity upon the City of Ninive, because their infants did not know their right hand from their left. Can any man believe that any body should be acquainted with the great and sublime matters of Jesus Christ, and eternall life,*

*Infants-Baptisme disproved.* III 11

life, that knowes not his right hand from his left in nature? and yet you say thus of children, viz. That they have the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, when as yet they have not knowledge to know their right hand from their left in nature.

3 Again, *They that know his name, will trust in him:* But you see Children in their infancy are call'd upon to doe neither.

4 Again, They that know God in Jesus Christ, are alwayes in the Scripture distinguished from those that know him not: If so, then all Children in their infancy know God in Jesus Christ, or else you must shew how some infants of eight dayes old may be judged to know him, and others may be judged to be ignorant of him. If you say you cannot distinguish, then I say you have as much reason to baptize a *Turks* Child at eight dayes old, as a Christians, since there appears as much of the knowledge of God in Christ in the one, as in the other, and then what becomes of your favour you would shew to believers Children?

Again, if they, viz. the infants of believers doe know God in Jesus Christ in their infancy, how comes many of them so wicked when they come to years? Doe you not here strongly smell of *Arminianisme*, which you so much preach against, that men may be in the saving knowledge of God to day, and out of it to morrow?

5 Again, the Scripture saith, *Without faith 'tis impossible to please God*, Heb. 11. and yet this is not to be applied to Children, because *James*

## Infants-Baptism disproved.

faith, *Faith without works is dead*, James 2. 17. So that if Children have faith in infancy, it's a dead faith, because it hath no works. *And faith without works cannot save*, ver. 14. So that you see this Text, Heb. 11. *Without faith it is impossible to please God*, must for what James saith, be understood of men that are arrived above the stature of infants of eight dayes old. In the like manner, must we understand Christ, John 17. *This is life eternall, that they know thee the onely true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*. Or else we must conclude, that some Children shall be damned dying in their infancy, for not knowing God in Jesus Christ, when they were no way made capable of such a knowledge.

Lastly, The Scriptures say, Deut. 1. 39. that Children in their infancy have no knowledge of good or evill; the like is said of Christ himself in his infancy, Isa. 7. 14, 15, 16. How then can you imagin that infants can know God in Jesus Christ, and yet not know good, when the knowledge of God in Christ is the knowledge of the best good of all.

But you goe on, and tell us,

*That infants dying in their infancy are saved.*

Which is not the thing denied; but the thing denied, is, That they cannot be saved without the knowledge of God in Christ; and instead of this, you would prove that infants shall be saved, which I never denied.

Only let me tell you, That you miserably abuse the Scripture you bring to prove their salvation,

vation, which is *Isa. 65. 20.* from which Text you observe,

*That they dye in as good a case, as Disciples of a hundred years standing.*

O miserable blindnesse! the Text saith, *There shall not be in the New Jerusalem an infant of dayes;* and yet you bring this in favour to your eight dayes infants.

Again, You say, *That infants dye in as good a condition, as Disciples of a hundred years standing;* whereas the Text saith, *The Child shall dye a hundred years old,* I pray how many such infants doe you baptize? So that this Text I believe you urged without Book, for there is not the least word of such infants as you plead for, nor of such old Disciples to whom you would compare them. But are you so charitable towards infants, that you believe they shall be saved? then pray let not the Midwives baptize, for fear they should be damned, which some of your cloath have allowed, making the sprinkling water upon their face, a cause of their salvation; rather then the knowledge of God in Christ, that you now plead for.

But you goe on, and tell us.

Mr. Kellie.

**T**Hat if we judge infants shall be saved, then they should be daily added to the Church by Baptism. And for this you cite *Acts 2. ult.*

Mr. Ives.



14 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

Mr. Ives.

I shall first speak to your Argument, and then to the Text.

This is a palpable *non sequitor*, for by this Argument *Moses* might have Circumcised Children the first day they were born; for *Moses* might have said, I judge these Children have a right to salvation the first day they are borne, therefore they have a right to be added to the Church by circumcisiō the first day they are born. Upon this account he might have circumcised the females, because he judged that salvation did belong to them. But if you shall think to salve this sore, by saying *He was commanded to circumcise the eighth day*, and to circumcise the male Children; let me tell you, that he was not forbid either the one or the other: But if you shall say, that in as much as God commanded the eighth day, he did forbid doing of it before; and in as much as he did Command the Circumcising of males, he forbid the circumcising of females: Let me tell you then, that in as much as God hath prescribed believing to be the time of baptizing, it will be found a sin to doe it upon any persons, at any other time but when they believe with all their hearts, according to *Acts 8. 37.* And as for that Text which you urge, *Acts 2. 47. The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.* Compare this but with *vers. 41.* and you will find these to be no such Babies as you baptize, and add to your Church; for the Text saith, *Then they that gladly received his word, were bapti-*  
zed,



zed, and the same day there was added to them about three thousand soules. And *Acts* 5. 14. Believers were added to the Lord. What serves this to prove that which you would have? Doth it not strongly carry the contrary, That infants were not baptized, because they are no where called Believers.

You now face about, as thoughall were not safe in the Rear, and goe back to the Text in *Esay* 54. Surely you feared all the hay and stubble that you built upon that Text, was set on fire by the Answers that I gave to it at your house, and now you are returning to quench it: But you must know, that your clouds of Arguments are without water, as I shall make appear upon Examination.

**First, You say,**

**Mr. Kellie.**

**T**hat teaching must be inward and effectually  
in *Isa.* 54. 13.

**Because it hath the great peace of God going along with it.**

**From whence you Argue thus:**

**They that have the great peace of God going along with their teaching, are inwardly and effectually taught:**

**But all the Children of Gods people have the great peace of God goe along with their teaching;**

**Therefore they are inwardly and effectually taught.**

**Mr. Ives.**

Mr. Iwe's.

**I** Answer this, by denying the major; for all the world gave the great peace of God going along with their teaching, in as much as God holds forth life and peace in the Gospel. And yet you will not say that all the world are inwardly and effectually taught.

2 Again, to your minor, if by all the Children of Gods people, you mean all their natural Children in their infancy, as you must, or else you say nothing to your purpose; then I doe deny the minor, because it supposeth God doth inwardly and effectually preach peace to believers infants, whereas he preacheth nothing at all to them: Neither doth the Text say he doth, for then they must (*viz.*) all the infants of believers, be actually saved, although they should live to perpetrate never such horrible wickednesses; for if they, to wit, all the naturall Children of believers, are in this condition in their infancy, what sin can deprive them of eternall life, when they come to years? unlesse (as I have said before) you will hold falling from this grace and peace you speak of, totally and finally; which is an opinion that you doe not reckon among the least of errors.

Again, if believers naturall Children, as such, are thus priviledged, as you speak of, with this grace and peace, then the Children of the flesh are the Children of God. But the Children of the flesh are not the Children of God. *Ergo.* They are not

not as believers naturall Children, thus privileged.

You goe on to a second Reason, to prove the teaching in *Isa. 54.* to be inward and effectuall teaching; which what if it were granted, doth it prove that this was to infants in the Cradle of eight dayes old: But we have before shewed the contrary, that it is not meant of such: But however let's hear your other Argument, which is.

*Mr. Kellie.*

**T**hat if it were not inward, and effectuall teaching, it were rather a judgement threatned, then a mercy promised.

*Mr. Ives.*

**B**elike then by this kind of reason, when God teacheth a people, and they doe not learn, his teaching is a judgement, and not a mercy. If this be true, then they that are under your teaching, and are not inwardly and effectually taught, doe not live under mercies, but judgements; and so they doe not despise a mercy, when they are not inwardly and effectually taught, but a judgement. The weight of this Reason is lighter then vanity.

Your third Reason that this must needs be inward and effectuall teaching, is,

**D**

*Mr. Kellie.*

17 *Infants Baptism disproved.*

Mr. Kellie.

**B**Ecause John brings it in as a proof of effectuall Teaching.

From whence you say the Argument may be thus framed.

**T**hey that are drawne to the Father, and come to the Son, are effectually taught:

But they that are taught according to that Scripture, Isa. 54. are drawne to the father, and come to the Son: Ergo.

They are inwardly and effectually taught.

Mr. Ives.

**H**ere the minor is denied, for the Reasons before named (*viz.*) For then all believers Children must all be saved, or else they may fall away from this teaching. And Christ himselfe doth suppose as much, in the place cited by you, out of John 6. 44, 45. where though he saith, *It's written, they shall be all taught of God*; here is not the least cry of the teaching of infants of eight dayes old.

But secondly, Though he saith, *They shall be all taught of God*, he doth not say, they shall all hear, learn, and come to him.

But he saith, *Every one that hath HEARD, and LEARNED, comes*, thereby shewing that more were taught, and more heard, then did learn and come to him.

You

You goe on to a fourth Reason, and say,

Mr. Kellie,

Children are all taught of God, because all know him from the least to the greatest, Heb. 8. 14.

Mr. Ives.

I Wonder you have forgot the Curse that God pronounceth against him that addeth, or taketh from his word; which if you had not, you would not have said, that all know him from the least, to the greatest; when the Text saith no such thing, but that they *SHALL* all know him from the least to the greatest; not that they *do* all know him. But if you say, they do all know him; then remember that the same Text saith, *They shall not need to teach their Neighbours, saying, know the Lord.* If this be already fulfilled, what do you preach for? And if all believers Children both little and great, know the Lord so as to need none to teach them, then you must find out another Trade, or else goe and teach among the Heathen; for you judge all the Parish of Cripple-gate believers, in as much as you baptize all their Children, and refuse none: And by the same rule you may as well judge all *England* believers, and if so, then if that all these believers and their Children know the Lord, according to that text, so as they need no Teacher, from the greatest to the least, then you must goe to Preach to the Infidells in *America*, for by your own Text we have

40 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

no need of you here. I doe therefore charge all men with folly in the Parish of *Criplegate*, that shall pay you a farthing for Preaching, till you doe repent of your folly in thus expounding *Heb. 8. 11.* For is it not folly for a man to pay for that he hath no need of?

5 You goe on, and tell us.

Mr. Kellie.

THat Children trust in God, *Psal. 22. 9.*  
Ergo.

Mr. Ives.

HERE you pervert Scripture, for the text saith not that Children trust in God in their infancy; but it saith that *David* as well as other infants were made by God to hope upon their mothers breasts; for these words [*When I was*] are unnecessarily supplied by the Translator, and are not in the Originall, and therefore we see that as well unbelievers as believers Children doe hope upon their mothers breast. I wonder how any man in his right wits can say from this Text, that *David* or any infant in their infancy doe trust in God? Nay, may not a man as rationally conclude, that the whole Creation are inwardly & effectually taught, and that they trust in God, because *Paul* saith, *Rom. 8. 20.* that the Creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that hath subjected the same IN HOPE.

You



*Infants-Baptism disproved.* 21

6 You goe on, and say,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat infants are most humble, therefore taught.

Mr. Ives.

**T**He Text that you urge, *Luke 9. 48.* saith no such thing, only that Christ set a little Child before them for example: I would therefore know whether or no the Text proves the humility of these Children to be by teaching, or by nature. If by teaching, then the Disciples had no need to learn of Children, because it cannot reasonably be supposed that infants in the Cradle should be taught more then those Master-builders that were to goe forth to teach others. If this humility was naturall to them, as to all Children before they come to have knowledge, then it makes nothing for your purpose; and that it was such, appears by the matter in hand, for the question was, who should be the greatest, *vers. 46.* Now he bids them take example of Children in their infancy, who then have no natural propensity to such kind of ambition, as to think themselves greater, or more honourable then others. In the like case Christ bids his Disciples *Be wise as Serpents*; may not a man as well conclude that Serpents are inwardly and effectually taught, because Christ sends his Disciples to learn wisdom of them, as you may conclude infants are inwardly and effectually taught, because Christ sends his Disciples to learn humility of them? And

## 22 *Infants-Baptism disproved.*

And Christ bids his Disciples to learn innocency of Doves, doth it therefore follow that Doves are inwardly and effectually taught?

7 You tell us

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat inward and effectuell teaching of infants appears from 1 Thess. 4. 9, 10. Where he tells the brethren, they were taught of God to love one another.

Mr. Ives.

**W**ould any body that had but common sense conclude that Paul writ this to infants, when he writes to the Thessalonians, that they are taught of God to love one another?

8 You tell us,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat you may say of infants; and their spirituall birth, and teaching, as Solomon saith of the naturall, Eccles. 11. 5. As thou knowest not which is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones doe grow in the womb of her that is with Child, even so thou knowest not the works of God that maketh all. Yet this I grant, that the time of Gods teaching is not alwayes in infancy; for some are called at the last houre, and you baptize some who (possibly) are not effectually called till afterwarde.

Mr. Ives.

Mr. Ives.

I Ndeed you may say so of their spirituall birth; for your tongue is your owne; but the Scripture speaks of no such spirituall birth in infants, as you doe imagine: And you have answered your selfe, and given a reason why you may not say of their spirituall birth, as *Solomon* doth of their naturall, because you say that many are not spirituallly born in their infancy; but I hope you cannot say so of any infants, that they have not a naturall birth; for though *Solomon* saith, *We doe not know how the Children are formed in the womb*, yet he denies not but they are all formed in the womb: But you as you doe not know how, so you confesse you doe not know who are spirituallly thus born. But is not this strange, that you should spend so many Arguments as you did a little before, to prove that all infants of believers are inwardly and effectually taught, drawn, and come to Christ, and that now you should tell us, that some of them are not called till the last houre: And if you should think to excuse the matter by saying, that you mean some unbelievers Children are not called till then; that will not doe, because you told me in the beginning of your paper, that it was for believers infants that you pleaded, and the whole scope of your paper speaks forth the same thing, and not one word of unbelievers Children, &c.

You tell us, *That some that we baptize are not effectually taught till afterwards.*

To this I answer, That it justifieth us if they doe.

doe professe so to be when they are baptized, *For with the heart man doth believe, and with the mouth confession is made to salvation, Rom. 10. 10.* And so it would justifie you, if that there were a confession of faith made at the time you did baptize, and a life conformable thereunto, which is all that we are to look after, because it's Gods work to search the heart, and not ours.

You proceed to prove (if you can) that infants are Disciples, thus.

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hey to whom we may give a Cup of cold water in the name of Disciples, are Disciples:

But we may give a Cup of cold water to little Children;

Therefore little Children are Disciples.

Mr. Ives.

**I** Answer, first, by denying the major; for may I not as well say, that they to whom we may give a thing in the name of a King, are Kings; and they to whom we may shew favour in the name of God, and Christ, are so many Gods and Christs; as you can say, they to whom we may give a cup of cold water in the name of a Disciple, are Disciples: Who seeth not the weaknesse of this kind of arguing? But now to the minor Proposition, where you assume that we may give to little children a cup of cold water in the name of a Disciple. I answer, If by little Children you mean such as John means, 1 John 2. 1. Little Children,

*dren, these things I write, that you sin not. And ver. 12. I write unto you little Children, because your sins are forgiven. I say, if you doe mean such, I doe grant the minor Proposition, viz. That to such little ones we may give a Cup of water in the name of a Disciple: But this I suppose cannot be your meaning, in as much as you are to prove that infants are Disciples, and there is nothing to that purpose in the Text: However I take notice of your wandring up and downe, in saying, Sometimes infants are Disciples, not telling us whether you mean believers or unbelievers infants. Sometimes that all believers infants are Disciples: And sometimes that some are not called till the last houre: Only we take for granted what you said at first, that you would undertake for believers Children: if so, then suppose that the little ones here in *Mat. 10. last.* were understood of infants, yet how doe you prove that they were believers infants? But it will be a task too hard for you to doe either the one, or the other.*

*You goe on to tell us,*

*Mr. Kellie.*

**T***hat you have five things more to say for infants Disciple-ship.*

*The first is this, If that infants may be called his servants, though they doe no service, Lev. 21. 41, 42.*

*Then they may be called Disciples, though they doe not appear to learn:*

*But they may be called Gods servants, though they doe him no service. Ergo.*

*They may be called Disciples, though they doe not appear to learn.*



Mr. Iw's.

**I** Answer, first, by denying the major, for if it be granted that Children were called his servants, though they did God no service, yet it followes not that therefore they are Disciples, though they doe not learn.

May not a man as well prove the unprofitable servant, *Luke 19.* by the same Logick, to be a Disciple? as thus: If one may be called Christs servant, though he doe him no work, then he may be called Christs Disciple, though he doe not appear to learn: But the unprofitable servant, *Luke 19.* was called Christs servant, as appears by *vers. 13.* and *Mat. 25. 14.* and yet he did him no work. *Ergo.* He was Christs Disciple, though he did not appear to learn: And by this Rule the *non sequitor* of your major Proposition appears.

But now to your minor, that Children are called Gods servants, though they did him no service.

I answer, first, That infants of eight dayes old are not called Gods servants any where in Scripture. 2 As to the Text urged in favour to this, *Lev. 25. 41, 42.* if you compare it with *vers. 39.* you will see it was not spoken to prove infants in the Cradle Gods servants, but rather to shew, that because the Nation of *Israel*, that he brought out of *Egypt*, were his servants, therefore they should not be slaves one to another, and sold as bond men, which they never did use to doe to Children in the Cradle.

3 Again, Cannot God speak many things concerning Children, as that they are his servants, &c. and yet not speak of Children in their infancy? May not a man as well say, because *Israel* was bid to teach their

their Children, that therefore they were to teach infants of eight dayes old? And because *Josh. 22. 10.* it's said *The Children of Gad built an Altar*, therefore the infants of Gad were Masons, and Stone-cutters? And because it's said of the vertuous woman, *Prov. 31. 20. Her Children rise up, and call her blessed*, therefore her little infants of eight dayes old did call her blessed? Is not this as good reason as that which you bring, *viz.* Because God saith, the *Israelites* children were his servants, therefore their infants of eight dayes old were his servants.

2 You goe on, and tell us, that

*Mr. Kellie.*

**P**eter in *Acts 15. 10. calls infants Disciples.*

*Mr. Ives.*

**A**Re you not ashamed to speak such a notorious falsity? Doth that Text say, that *Peter* calls infants Disciples? Oh what a mercy is it that we can read! surely if we could not, you might as well say, that *Peter* said you should have the fifth penny of our estate for preaching, as say he saith, Infants are Disciples.

Now indeed *Peter* blames them for putting the yoke of Circumcision upon Disciples; but this doth no more prove infants to be Disciples, then if a man would say, The Clergy are oppress'd by Taxes, therefore every one that's oppress'd by Taxes, is a Clergyman; for is it not the same that you bring? The Disciples were circumcised, therefore all that they circumcised, were Disciples. Now if you look to the foregoing verses, you shall see that the false Teachers taught circumcision to the brethren, and not to infants, and told the Disciples, that if they were not

circumcised, they could not be saved. And now if it be granted, that they would have circumcised infants, as well as old folks, doth this prove infants are old folks? No more doth your saying, they would circumcise Disciples, prove infants to be Disciples.

You proceed to a third Reason why Children should be Disciples, and that is this, *viz.*

*Mr. Kellie.*

**T**hat if you should grant they are not learned, but ignorant; yet ignorance (you say) did not debar from Circumcision, therefore not from baptism.

*Mr. Ives.*

**I** Answer, by shewing you how willing you are to gather up any thing to serve your turne, though nothing to purpose; one while they, *viz.* infants, are to be baptized, because believers Children, doe know the Lord, and are taught of God, &c. And now you plead, they may be baptized, though ignorant: What a miserable shuffling is here? What knowledge the cause all this while, and now be baptized though they are ignorant, what strange Logick is this?

But to the Consequence, *viz.* Ignorance (you say) did not hinder from Circumcision, therefore not from baptism.

**I** answer, first, ignorance could not hinder infants from that which God commanded Parents to doe unto their Children, while they were infants; so that if God had commanded parents to baptize their infants, then their ignorance could not hinder, no more then it could hinder their parents from Circumcising them, after God had commanded it. But here you doe beg the question, by taking it for granted,

ted, that God commanded infants to be baptized, as he did Command the Children of *Abraham* to be Circumcised:

2 Again, in Gospel worship whatever is not of faith, is sin. God will (in Gospel worship) be served in Spirit, which is a service no where required of infants, therefore ignorance must needs hinder infants from that which God no where requireth, and which they are no way capable to perform.

You goe on, and tell us, that

*Mr. Kellie.*

**I**gnorance did not hinder *Peter* from his Masters washing his feet, John 13. 7, 8. The 7<sup>th</sup> verse (you say) shewes his ignorance, and the 8<sup>th</sup> the necessity of his washing.

*Mr. Ives.*

**W**Hy doe you not conclude somewhat from hence, or else why doe you bring it? If you bring it to prove that therefore ignorance may not hinder Children from baptism, then pray see whether or no *Peter* did not know Christ washed his feet, and whether in reason can you believe that Christ could wash *Peters* feet, and *Peter* be as ignorant of his washing, as your babies are of their sprinkling.

Again, it plainly appears that *Peter* was ignorant, not of the washing it selfe, but of somewhat Christ would make known by it, which was to shew, That they whom he washed should learn of him to doe so to others; and therefore Christ asketh his Disciples if they knew what he had done to them. Now they could not but know he had washed them, but they did not know that he had hereby set them a Gopy to write after; and therefore if your Children had

as much knowledge of Christ when you baptize them, as *Peter* had when Christ washed his feet, though they might not know all circumstances relating to baptism, then indeed it were somewhat to your purpose to quote this place.

Again, is it not a strong signe of a weak cause, that you should compare the ignorance of *Peter* to the ignorance of your infants? his being but a partiall ignorance in a circumstance, and your Babes are totally ignorant of both substance and circumstance. Again, this Law of washing the Disciples feet was never in practice before, till Christ now did it, and commanded it; and therefore no marvell though the Apostles were ignorant of the end of it, till it was declared; neither was there any such qualifications required in washing one anothers feet, as is required in baptisme.

You proceed, and say, that

*Mr. Kellie.*

**T**He Scripture doth not say, *None shall be baptized but understanding Disciples, and if it did (you say) yet that had not excluded infants; for the Apostile saith, He that will not labour, must not eat, and yet Children (say you) must not starve, though they doe not labour.*

*Mr. Ives.*

**T**O this I answer, first, that the Scripture doth not say, you shall not baptize, bells, nor goe a Pilgrimage, why then do not you do these things?

2 Again it did not say (as we have elsewhere observed) that the Children of *Abraham* should not be circumcised the sixth or fourth day, why then did not they doe it before? Nor the Scripture doth not say,



say, Infants shall not receive the Sacrament of the bread and wine, why doe you then refuse to give it them? Doe you not plainly see that you condemn others in the thing you allow? for you condemn us that will not baptize our infants, because you say it's no where forbidden; why may not others as well condemn you for refusing to give the Lords Supper to infants, by the same rule, because it's no where forbidden.

I but you will say, it's implicitly forbidden, 1 Cor. 11. 28. because the Text saith, *Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eat*; and Children cannot examine themselves. In the like manner (say I) infants are denied baptism, because the Scripture saith, *He that BELIEVETH, and is baptized, &c.* Mark 16. and *If thou BELIEVEST, thou mayest be baptized,* Acts 8. Doe not these in the judgement of any rational man as plainly exclude infants from baptism, as the other Scripture doth exclude them from the Supper?

But you presume and say, that

Mr. Kellie.

**I**F the Scripture had said, *None but understanding Disciples should be baptized, that had not excluded infants.*

Mr. Ives.

**I**S not this strange that you should say, That they are not to be excluded, though the Scripture doe exclude them? Doe you not hereby give us to understand, that let the word of God say what it will, you will doe what you list? Neither doe you think to mend the matter by that place of Scripture, 2 Thess. 3. 10. *If any will not worke, he should not eat.* Now you seem to conclude from hence, that though Children doe not work, yet they must eat, *Ergo.* Though children

dren doe not believe, yet they must be baptized. Now see the fallacy; the Text doth not say, *He that DOETH not worke*, as you say, when you apply it to infants; but *He that WILL not worke*. Now if there be any children that WILL not work, they must not eat, viz. of the Churches Charity; therefore infants, and they that are impotent, it cannot be said of them that *they WILL not work*. Now if God had given you the like Command to baptize Children in their infancy, as he hath done to fathers and mothers to feed them in their infancy, then you had said something to the purpose, otherwise you had as good have said nothing.

Mr. Kellie.

Again, You (say I) brought in the word *αἰῶς*, to prove that the Command, *Mat. 28. reacheth only Disciples, not all Nations*; my reason (you say) is, *Because ἰδm is the Nenter, and αἰῶς the Masculine Gender. But this (you say) is no reason at all, as appears by Mat. 25. 32. where the word αἰῶς must needs have relation to ἰδm, unlesse there shall not be a separation between all Nations at the last day. This Enallage generis, where the Masculine Gender is put with ἰδm, is usuall in Scripture, and many times (you say) includes Children, as Mat. 25. 32. Rev. 2. 26, 27. & 19. 15. Acts 15. 17. & 21. 25. & 26. 17. & 28. 28, Ephef. 2. 11. & 4. 17.*

Mr. Ives.

1 **Y**OU did agree at your house, that *αἰῶς* did relate to *Disciple*, and accordingly went about to prove that Children were Disciples, as appears by many of your Arguments.

2 I said not that *αἰῶς* did no where refer to *ἰδm*, but that in this Scripture it ought to refer to *παῖδες*, which you also granted.

3 Though

3 Though <sup>avē</sup> be referred to <sup>ēdm</sup>, yet it doth not follow that the infants in the Nations are included, yea, the contrary is apparent from the latter clause of the sentence, where it is said, *Teaching them*, which doth sufficiently intimate, that those of the Nations are hereby only meant, who are capable of Discipline, and consequently had the use of reason, which agreeth not unto infants, who, as the Scripture sheweth, together with the attestation of common sense, have no knowledge between good and evil. *Deut.* 1. 39. *Moreover, your little ones which you said should be a prey, and your Children which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall goe in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall possesse it. Iſai* 7. 14, 15, 16. *Therefore the Lord himſelfe ſhall give you a ſigne, behold a Virgin ſhall conceive a Son, and ſhall call his name Imanuel. Butter and Honey ſhall be eat, that he may know to reſuſe the evil, and chooſe the good. For before the Child ſhall know to reſuſe the evil, and chooſe the good, the Land that thou abhorreſt, ſhall be forſaken of both her Kings. Likewise the very inſtance you bring out of* *Mat.* 25. 32. doth refute your opinion, for there ſuch only of the Nations are underſtood, as had acted in the world, and done either good or evil; for they are ſuch as had either relieved Chriſt in his neceſſity, or reſuſed to doe ſo; neither of which agreeth to infants; for would it not be ridiculous to imagine that our Lord Chriſt ſhould ſay to the infants, *Goe yee curſed into everlaſting fire, for I was hungry, and yee fed me not?* Beſides, every one of the reſt of the places cited by you, where the word <sup>ēdm</sup> is found, doth, if the circumſtances be examined, mean them only of the Nations that had the uſe of reaſon,

and so are not a whit to your purpose.

4 You goe on to another Argument, and tell me, that

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat which God hath once commanded, and never repealed, ought still to be obeyed:

*But he did once Command that the Children of his servants, whom he hath taken into Covenant with himselfe, should have the seale of the righteousnesse of faith set upon them, which he hath never forbidden, only he hath taken away the outward circumcision, therefore we must obey that Command still.*

Mr. Ives.

**I** Doe deny this whole Sillogism, because first, there is not one of the terms of the Propos: in it; which had you argued honestly, you should have said thus, *That which God once commanded, and never repealed, is in force still:* (and then you should have assumed) *But God did once Command the baptizing of infants, and never repealed it; therefore that Command is in force still.* Indeed had you reasoned thus, and proved the minor, a gracious heart would hardly have denied it: But then

2 This Argument contradicts it selfe; for you say, He did once Command, and never afterwards forbid that infants should have the seale and token of the Covenant; and yet you say presently after, That Circumcision was taken away; then it follows, that the seale of it was prohibited, and the use of it forbidden; is not this a palpable contradiction? For what was the seale of faith that God commanded to *Abraham*? Was it not Circumcision? *Gen. 17. 10. Rom. 10. 11.* If so, then when Circumcision

sion was repealed, that Law which commanded nothing else, must needs be repealed; and if the Law be in force, it must require some other thing as well as Circumcision, and so be but in part repealed; if so, shew me what part of that Law can be in force, if Circumcision be repealed. You might as well have said, that *James Duke Hamilton* was alive, after *James Earl of Cambridge* was beheaded, as say that that Law given to *Abraham*, *Gen. 17. 10.* is in force, and yet say Circumcision was taken away. Who but those are willfully ignorant, doth not see this empty kind of arguing?

You proceed to another Argument, and tell me, that

*Mr. Kellie.*

**T**hey which had a right to the Ordinance that was profitable every way, have still a right to baptism:

*But the Children of Gods people have a right to that Ordinance that was profitable every way. Ergo.*

*The Children of Gods people have a right to baptism.*

*Mr. Ive's.*

**T**His Argument among the rest we met with at your house; and I did then, and so I doe now deny the major; for if you look the text upon which it is grounded, *Rom. 3. 1, 2.* you will find that this Ordinance you speak of, was Circumcision; so that then the major Proposition in plain English is this, *They that had had a right to Circumcision, have a right to baptism;* if this be a good Argument, why doe you plead for the infants of believers so much? May you not as well plead for the unbelieving *Jewes*, and their infants by the same reason, thus, *They that had a right to circumcision, have a right to baptism; but the*



*Jews and their infants had a right to Circumcision, therefore they have a right to baptism now.* If you shall say, so they have, if they convert to believe in Christ, I say then you have answered your selfe; and then it followeth not that their right to Circumcision did give them a right to baptism; but their believing in Christ, for if it did, you must baptize a Jew though he did never believe.

You now come to scare me with great words, since you cannot doe it by Arguments; and this you endeavour to doe, by telling me of fearfull and base Absurdities that will follow upon what I have said in denying infants baptism.

The first Absurdity (you say) is,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**Hat if baptism be denied to the infants of believers; then the Children of the Devills servants under the Law, had better means of grace confer'd upon them; then the dearest Children of the best servants of God have now under the Gospel, though the Gospel be a better Covenant, established upon better Promises, Heb. 7. 22. Heb. 8. 6, &c.

Mr. Ives.

**I** Answer to this, first, by denying the Consequence; for it doth not follow they had better priviledg s then, then we have now, if we deny them baptism: But the contrary is true, we are, and so are our Children, freed from those rudiments they were in bondage to, Gal. 4. 3, 4. and Vers. 5. 'tis said, *Christ came to redeem us from the Law.* And in Acts 15. 10. (your Text that you did alledge for infants Discipleship) Circumcision is there call'd a yoke that neither they nor their fathers were able to bear; and yet

yet you presume to call this a priviledge, which the Scripture calls a bondage, and a yoke. But if you shall say, that in *Rom.* 3. 1, 2: the Apostle saith, they had *advantage by it*. I answer, that proves not but that it was a yoke; for a servant hath an advantage by a Prentiship, doth it follow therefore that an Apprentiship is not a state of bondage? Now if God will freely bestow those things upon our infants without either Circumcision or baptism, this is so far from lesse grace, that it is more grace then was bestowed upon infants under the Law. And I challenge you and all the world to shew me one Text in all the Bible where God doth either threaten parents or Children with the losse of any favour, either spirituall or temporall, for not baptizing their infants. It so, then your talking of denying them favour, by denying them baptism, is but a figment of your own braine.

And whereas you talk of the Children of the Devils servants, that *they had more priviledge then we, because they were Circumcised.*

I answer, first, the Text that you bring to prove it, *Ezek.* 16. 20. saith not so. 2 It saith they did offer their Children in the fire; but yet remember, that this Chapter treats of the whole Nation of *Israel*, which you spake so much in favour of but even now, though you now call them the Children of the Devil; but be it so, you have heard that their priviledge you plead for, was a bondage that God hath freed our infants from, and as long as you confesse they are freed from Circumcision, and you cannot prove any other thing is injoynd to infants, what's become of your great Absurdity?

Your

Your second Absurdity is like the first, for (you say) that

Mr. Kellie.

**D**enyng infants baptism, shewes God is lesse carefull; and his love is lesse, and his faithfullnesse is lessened towards infants now, over it was of old. And this you would prove from Jer. 30. 20. & Mic. 7. last.

Mr. Ives.

**I**N the first of these Scriptures it is said, that the Children of Israel shall be as afore time; and you say the Children of his people in the Gospel shall be as the Children of his servants afore time; which is altogether false, for it is a Prophecie of their return from all Nations, to become a Nation again as before time, as any body may see, that doth not wink, at Jer. 30. 18. And as for this Text, if by making infants under the Gospel, as the Jewes were under the Law, if that be your notion upon the Text, and the word afore time, then we must circumcise them, or else they cannot be as afore time: Doe you not pervert Scripture to make us Judaize? And to that Text, Mic. 7. last. where God saith, He will perform his truth to Jacob, &c. I demand first, whether ever God swore to Jacob, or the fore-fathers, or ever made any promise to them, that their infants under the Gospel should be baptized; if he did, show us where; if he did not, then you doe but slander God, instead of bringing the least absurdity upon me, in saying, that he is unfaithfull, &c. if infants are not baptized. And you tell us that Christ, Luke 1. 71, 72. Came into the world for this end; it's true, he came to fulfill what God had promised before time, but how doth this bear hard

hard either upon his love or faithfullnesse, viz. Not to baptize infants, unlesse, as I have said, he had before promised they should be baptized?

Your third Absurdity, is that

Mr. Kellie.

**D**enyng infants baptism, doth dishonour Gods wisdom; because we look upon it as folly (say you) to administer an Ordinance to infants; but the wise God did administer an Ordinance upon the infants that did not understand it.

Mr. Ives.

**T**O this I answer, That our denying infants baptism doth rather dishonour your wisdom, and the wisdom of this world, then the wisdom of God, because God never required it at your hands. And whereas you say, *God did administer an Ordinance to ignorant infants, &c.* I demand if this be not horrible presumption for you to administer an Ordinance upon infants without a Command, because the most high God caused an Ordinance once to be administered by a Command? And whether now for any one to oppose this practice of yours, be not much rather a flying in the face of your wisdom, then Gods? It's no marvell then that you say, *Here is enough to kindle your spirit against my opinion for ever,* because indeed denying infants baptism, sets as it were a fire the foundation of your Craft, by which you beguile the simple: And you know this put a fire into the breast of the men of Ephesus, against the Apostles Doctrine, when they understood that the gaine they got by their Will-worship, was like to be set at naught.

Your fourth and last Absurdity that you say follows

lowes upon denying infants baptism, is, that

Mr. Kellie.

**I**T makes believing parents and their Children, worse then Heathen and their Children, in whom the Prince of the power of the aire ruled, &c.

Tet such (say you) coming into the acknowledgement of the true God, had not onely themselves, but their infants taken into Covenant, and had the token thereof, which (you say) I deny to Children.

Mr. Ives.

**T**HIS is all one with your first Absurdity, & therefore the same Answer will serve it; for was not this your first Absurdity that you said followed denying infants baptism, *Viz.* That the Children of the Devills servants under the Law, had better means of grace confer'd upon them, then the Children of the best servants of God have. And what doe you say more now? For what difference is there between believers, and their infants, and Gods best servants, and their infants? And what difference is there between the Children of the Devills servants, and the Children of those in whom the Prince of the aire ruleth? &c. And what difference is there between circumcising the Children of the Devills servants under the Law, and circumcising the Children of those in whom the Prince of the aire ruled, &c.

But yet a word to this, though it be one with the former: First, how doth my opinion make them, *Viz.* believing Parents, and their infants, worse then Heathens, and their infants under the Law? since by your own confession neither the Heathen, nor his infant was to be Circumcised, till he, *Viz.* the Heathen, had acknowledged the true God, so that then he



he sealed to be a Heathen. In like manner therefore as the Converts to the *Jewes* Religion, were they and their children to partake of all the priviledges of the Law, upon obedience of all the Commands of God in the Law : so all Converts to the Christian Religion, and their Children, upon obedience to all the Commands in the Gospel, shall be made partakers of the priviledges of the Gospel : But now if God hath not Commanded believers infants to be baptized, nor promised any priviledge to their baptism in infancy, nor threatned any detriment to those infants that wanted it, as he did to infants that wanted Circumcision, he told their Parents that *that soule should be cut off from the people*. I say, if there be neither Precept for baptism of infants, nor Promise of Priviledge to their infants baptism, nor detriment threatned to the want of it, then you rather quarrel and find fault with God ( because he did not make a Law for believers infants to be baptizd ) then with me ; and because he did not promise them some favour that were baptized in their infancy, and impose some penalty upon those infants that were not so baptized. Now indeed if you had shewed us any such thing, then you had made good your charge ; but till you doe so, you ( as I have said ) rather quarrell with God for not making such a Law, then with me for not keeping of it. And whereas you say, *I deny infants the seale* ; You are first to shew where baptism is called a seale, or else to deny them baptism, is not to deny them a seale. 2 You must shew us, if baptism be a seale, whether God did any where command us to set it upon infants : And 3 in what place of the Child it must be set ; for we know in the Law it was

set upon the fore-skin of their privy members. This you must doe before you can fasten any Absurdity upon me, in denying a seale to infants.

You come now to remember me of somewhat that I said at your house, *Viz.* You did run in a round when you said Children had a right to the Ordinance that was profitable every way, and therefore ought to be baptized; and you tell me, that

Mr. Kellie.

**M***I saying you did run in a round, did contradict myselfe, and give away my cause.*

Mr. Ive's.

**T**O this I answer, that this is sooner said, then proved, *Viz.* That I gave away the Cause; but however, I perceive that you would be willing to be counted a ridiculous Disputant, and so ridiculous as circular disputing is accounted in Schools, so that I would but give away my cause, which is not mine, but the Lord Christs. This appears plainly, for you say that I told you, you run in a circle; which you doe not in the least indeavour to vindicate your self from; but say by this I gave away my cause. But if you had urged all that I had said at that time, it would not so appear; for when you argued, That if infants had a right to the Ordinance that was profitable every way, then they had a right to baptism. But they had a right to that Ordinance that was profitable every way. *Ergo.* I did then answer, by distinguishing of the terms of the major Proposition, *Viz.* What you meant by the Ordinance that was profitable every way: (I then said) if you meant Circumcision, then you run in a circle, because that was the thing denied in the former Sillogism, *Viz.*

That

That they that had a right to Circumcision, had a right to baptism, which you endeavoured to prove, by saying, *They that had a right to the Ordinance profitable every way, had a right to baptism.* If by this you meant Circumcision, then you did but run round, and no way prove the thing denied, but in effect said it over again. I further said, That if by the Ordinance that was profitable every way, you meant baptism, then I denied the Sillogism; for then it must have run thus, *They that have a right to baptism, have a right to baptism.* Indeed I should have had so much respect to your gray haires, that I should not have mentioned this your weaknesse, had you not in your Paper both mentioned it, and gloried in it, as though thereby you had made me give away my Cause. And that I did at your house detect your false Logick after this manner, as I have laid it down. I shall appeale to those Gentlemen that are well learned in the Rules of discourses, that were then at your house, and to whom I did then appeale in the same case.

You proceed to more Reasons for infants-baptism, if I may so call them without giving away my cause again. The first is,

Mr. Kellie.

**B**ecause they are in Covenant, which you would prove by Deut. 29. 10. to 15. Deut. 30. 11, 12, 13. Rom. 1. 7. 10.

From hence you argue, that *If they are in Covenant, they may be baptized.*

Mr. Ives.

**I** Deny the Consequence, for by this rule *Moses* might have baptized as well as circumcised, if a

bare being in the Covenant were a reason why they should baptize; but you must remember, that it is the Command of Christ that we look at; and if he had not commanded believers to be baptized, their being believers would not have justified their baptism: So if it were granted that infants were in the Covenant, what reason is this why they should be baptized, if God hath not commanded it? Doe you not here open a door for will-worship, and other Popish fooleries? For may not they say they doe them because they are in Covenant? Further, doe you not here sin because grace abounds? For is God so good as to place our infants in Covenant with himselfe, must we therefore goe take the holy name of God in vaine, and sprinkle water upon their faces for a seale, as though we doubted whether God would keep his Covenant, unlesse we sealed it with a seale of our owne making? But to the Texts. First, if you look *Deut. 1. 39.* you will find the Covenant here is not the same that was made with them when they came out of *Ægypt*; for he saith, *It is a Covenant BESIDES the Covenant he made then.* 2 Compare *But Vers. 10.* to *Vers. 12.* and you will find that they stood that day before the Lord, that they MIGHT enter into Covenant, &c. Now then this could not be the Covenant made with *Abraham*, because that was confirmed, and *Israel* had it sealed to them long before; neither was it the Covenant made when they came out of *Ægypt*, if so, then it could not be the Covenant that your seale you talk of did belong unto. 2 It could not be the Covenant of grace by *Jesus Christ*, unlesse you say there was two Covenants of grace, *Viz.* one made with them before they

they went into *Ægypt*, and another after their coming out of *Ægypt*: Now if this was not a Covenant of grace by Christ, spoken of *Deut.* 29. what doth it availe to the matter in hand? unlesse you say they that are in any Covenant have a right to baptism. And if you say it was a Covenant of grace by Jesus Christ, that is here mentioned, then pray consider what followes, that the Covenant of grace by Jesus Christ was made with them, that ( as the 4 verse saith ) *The Lord had not given a heart to perceive, nor eyes to see, nor ears to hear unto that day.* So that whereas you have been telling of us of a Covenant with believers and their seed all this while; you now come to tell us of a Covenant made with unbelievers, and their seed, for so were these at the time of the making of it: So that if your Logick be good, *Viz. Believers and their infants are in Covenant, therefore they and their infants must be baptized.* And the Text you bring to prove it, saith the same of unbelievers, then by your owne Text, infidells and their infants may be baptized: But the Text you bring saith the same of unbelievers. *Ergo.* That the Text saith, this Covenant was made with unbelievers, compare *Deut.* 29. 4. with *Rom.* 11. 8. where speaking of the *Jewes* not believing in Christ, he saith, *God ( as it is written ) alluding to this very Text, Deut. 29. 4. ) had given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and eares that they should not hear unto this day:* And yet these are the believers whom you say are in Covenant; and therefore their infants must be baptized. But I confesse I doe not wonder at this, because most of them whose infants you baptize, are such believers, if I may so call them, as have

not



not a heart to perceive, nor eyes to see, to this very day, else they would not receive for doctrine the traditions of men, and leave the plain way of Christ. You add, though to as little purpose as before, *Deut.* 30. 11, 12. & *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. where ( I confesse ) the Apostle alluding to the fore-cited place of *Deuteronomy*, saith, that *the word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and heart, even the word of faith* which he preached; and therefore the righteousness of faith he tells us is this, *Vers.* 9, 10. *That if thou shalt confesse with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* You bid me compare this Text with *Deut.* 29. which I much wonder at, since I do not know any two Texts in all the Bible that have more disparity; for in the one place it's said, *They had not a heart to believe*; and in the other it is said, *With the heart man believeth*. Again, as this Text hath no affinity with the former, so, it hath no affinity to the matter in hand; for to what purpose doe you cite a Text that speaks of believers who professe Christ with their mouths, and believe him in their hearts, to justify the baptism of infants, that never opened their mouths for Christ? Truly Sir, were it not that I am relieved with this saying, *Opere in longo fax est obrepere somnum*, I should despair of having any thoughts of charity towards a man that professeth himself ( as you doe ) both a Christian, and a Scholar, and yet reason at this rate.

You add a second Argument, and say, that

Mr. Kellie.

Mr. Kellie.

**B**Ecause they are in Covenant, the initiating token of the Covenant must needs be theirs.

Mr. Iwe's.

**I** Answer, That here you have not concluded the terms of the Question, therefore I may deny the whole Argument.

2 But further, If by the initiating token of the Covenant you mean baptism, let me see then how you can call this a second Argument, except you tell the first twice over? For was not this the Argument that went before? *Viz. They that are in the Covenant have a right to baptism*; and is not the second the same word for word, if by the token of the Covenant you mean baptism; therefore the answer to the first is also an answer to that you call a second: And whereas you say that the Text, *Gen. 17.* tells us that every Man-child had the token of the Covenant, because they were in the Covenant; why I pray had not the women-children the token of the Covenant? were not they in the Covenant? Can you deny it? and yet you see they were not circumcised: And were not the males in the Covenant (as I have said once and again) as soon as they were born, why were they denied the token of it till eight dayes old? they might have died, as doubtlesse many of them did in this intervaile of time between their birth and the eighth day: Therefore you see that infants being in the Covenant, could be no Argument to prove their Circumcision, till the time God appointed, though their lives had laine upon it. In the like manner all your talking of infants being in the Covenant, cannot lawfully justifie their baptism, till  
the

the time comes that God commands it : And this kept female infants from Circumcision, *Viz.* because God had not commanded it. Although they were in the Covenant, yet you see they were denied the token of the Covenant.

You urge another Text, which is *Ezek. 37. 25.* where God promises by his Prophet, that *The Tribes of Israel shall be joynd together, and shall dwell in their owne Land they and their Children, and their Childrens Children for ever, under the Conduct of Christ their Prince in the latter dayes.* And you say this proves infants should be baptized. Did ever any body infer thus from a Text? *Israel* and their Children shall come to dwell in their own land in the latter dayes, and Christ shall be their Prince. *Ergo.* The infants of believers must be baptized. This is the substance of the Text from whence you thus infer, as any body may see that doth but read the Chapter. But now, suppose this, that this were applicable to believing *Gentiles*, doth it not follow, that if the seed of the righteous, and their Children, and their Childrens Children for ever, should be baptized, that then we may baptize all the world, since they are all, and will be for ever, the seed of *Noah*, who was a faithfull man?

You tell us in the third place, that

Mr. Kellie.

**I**nfants are included in the Command of baptism, because *Christ saith, Luke 9. 48. They that receive a little Child, receive Christ.*

Mr. Iwe's.

**M**ight you not better have said, that this little Child was Christ, then have concluded that the

the little Child was included in the Command of baptism? May we not as well say, That the Converts were Commanded to baptize the Apostles, rather then the Apostles were commanded to baptize them, because Christ saith to his Apostles, *Mat. 10. 40. He that receiveth you, receiveth me.* May not a man as well upon the other hand say, That he that refused the Apostles, refused to baptize the Apostles, as you may say the receiving, or non receiving of infants, is a receiving of them to, or a rejecting them from baptism.

Again, *He that receiveth an Angell of God, is said to receive God;* may not a man as well plead from hence, Therefore Angels may be baptized, as you may, in saying, *He that receiveth a little Child, receiveth Christ? Therefore a little Child must be baptized.* And whereas you say, *That a refusing to baptize infants, is a refusing to receive Christ.* How strangely do you contradict your selfe? Did not you say in the former part of your paper, *That many that we baptized, were not inwardly and effectually called till afterwards?* Now doth not this plainly prove, That we that refuse to baptize Children, doe yet notwithstanding receive Christ; for what is it to be inwardly and effectually called, but to receive Christ?

In the fourth place, you say, that

*Mr. Kellie.*

**T**hey are included in baptism, for whom Christ appears so much, as we find, *Mark 10. 13. Luke 18. 15. which (you say) Luke saith were infants, &c.*

*Mr. Ives.*

**I** Answer, You take great paines to prove that which nones denies, *That these that Christ tooke*

*in his armes, were infants : But how doe you prove that which is denied, That these infants were baptized by Christ. You say, That Christ reprov'd his Disciples for not suffering the infants to come to him. Which shewes plainly, that baptizing them was no part of their businesse that brought them : First, because if it were a Command of Christ to baptize infants, the Disciples that were his Messengers, were then ignorant of a great part of their Message, that they were to deliver in their Ministry. Or else 2 If they did know that it was their work, and Christs Command to baptize infants, they were desperately wicked in keeping any from it : This was not onely to break a Command, but to teach men so, and to be guilty of that abominable evill the Pharisees were guilty of, Viz. Of not entring into Heaven themselves, nor suffering others. This will follow, if to keep infants from baptism, be to keep them from Christ, as you would make it.*

But that they were not baptized when they came to Christ, appears because the Text saith, *John 4. 2. that Jesus himselfe baptized NOT, but his Disciples.*

And whereas you say,

*Mr. Kellie.*

**H***ands were laid upon them, by which greater things then baptism was done.*

*Mr. Ives.*

**I***Answer, By the same rule you may give the bread and wine in the Sacrament, to infants, because greater things were done by laying on of hands, then eating bread, and drinking wine : And why doe you not by this rule preach to Children in their Cradles, because greater wonders were wrought by laying*



laying on of hands, then ever were done by Preaching. Who sees not but this Argument is as strong for Preaching to infants, and giving the Lords Supper to infants, as it is for baptizing infants? And yet though you allow them baptism, you deny them both the other Ordinances.

You say, *Christ blessed them, as well as layd hands on them, which (say you) is as much, if not more then baptism.* And is not his blessing as much, if not more then your giving the Sacrament of the Supper to them? Why then doe you deny them of it?

You say,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**Hat was a good reason for Christ to blesse them, viz. *Because the Kingdome of Heaven belonged to them, and therefore it must needs be a good reason for us to baptize them.*

Mr. Ives.

**I** Answer, first, why this was not a good reason for CHRIST to baptize them, & yet the Scripture saith, *He baptized none.*

2 Doth not infants right to the Kingdome of heaven intitle them to all other Ordinances, as well as baptism, since under the Gospel whoever were found to be members of a true Church by baptism, had also fellowship of all other Church-priviledges, except they had ( by some scandalous evils ) deprived themselves thereof; so that infants right to the Kingdome of Heaven, serves nothing for your present purpose.

Your fifth Reason is,

G 2

Mr. Kellie.

Mr. Kellie.

**I**Nfants are branches of the true Olive, Rom. 11. 17. Therefore they are included in the Command of baptism.

Mr. Ive's.

**I** Answer, first by denying the antecedent; for the infants of believers are not branches of the Olive in the Text, but onely such as did actually believe, and there is not the least mention made of their infants in the whole Chapter; for the 20 verse saith, *That for want of faith the Jewes were broke off, and by faith the Gentiles did stand*; which faith is not to be found in your infants you plead for.

2 To be branches by generation (if that were the sense of the Text) could not give them a right to baptism, because the Jewes were naturall branches, and yet that could not give them a right to baptism without faith.

Your sixth Reason is,

Mr. Kellie.

**B**Ecause infants of believers are Abrahams seed, and so consequently members of Christ, Gal. 3. 16. And baptism (you say) is an Ordinance of our incorporation into Christ, 1 Cor. 12. 13. Therefore (you say) they that are members of Christ should not be denied that Ordinance.

Mr. Ive's.

**I** Cannot but wonder at your presumption; doth the word of God any where say that the carnall seed of believers are members of Christ? Doth it not say the contrary, that even Abrahams owne seed were not the Children of God, as they were his carnall seed, Rom. 9. 7. Neither because they are the seed  
of

*Abraham*, are they Children, which is expounded, *Vers. 8. That is* (saith the Apostle) *they which are the Children of the flesh, they are not the Children of God.*

2 Again, How dare you say that the naturall seed of believers in their infancy, are the seed of *Abraham*? since that *Abrahams* own seed were under the Gospel no otherwise reckoned for his seed, then by believing, *Gal. 3. 7. Know yee therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the Children of Abraham, v. 9. They which are of faith, are blessed with faithfull Abraham*: And what ever *Abrahams* seed, and the Profelites seed were accounted under the Law, it makes not at all to your purpose, unlesse you prove God doth so account of them under the Gospel: And therefore the Apostle saith not of seeds, as to many; but *to thy seed*, which is Christ: So that by this which you cited out of *Gal. 3. 16.* it appears the Promises were not made to the naturall seed of believers, but unto Christ, or them that were Members of his mysticall body by believing. And the Apostle tels them, *That so many of them as had been baptized into Christ, had put on Christ*, which was by making profession of Christ, which your infants doe not; and therefore the same Apostle concludeth, *That if they were Christs, then they were Abrahams seed*: Not if they were believers naturall Children, that they upon any such consideration should be Heires of the Promise.

Your seventh reason is,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat infants may be baptized, because they are holy:  
Which you indeavour to prove from 1 Cor.

7. 14.

Mr. Ives.

Mr. Ive's.

**I** Doe deny that the holinesse of these infants gave a right to baptism; for by the same rule the believers wife must be baptized, though she was an unbeliever; for the same Text saith, *That the believers unbelieving wife was sanctified*: And may I not as well say, That all that are sanctified in any sense may be baptized; as you may say, Because infants in some sense are holy, therefore they may be baptized.

You further urge *Gal. 2. 15.* which I believe you did mistake your selfe in, as any body may see that shall but compare the Text with the matter in hand. To as little purpose you urge *Dan. 8. 24.* where the Text saith, *The King of fierce countenance should destroy the holy people*: Therefore the infants were holy. May not a man as well say, from *Dan. 12. 7.* where it's said, *He shall scatter the power of the holy people*; that therefore the infants had power? The like answer serves to *Dan. 11. 8.*

8 You say,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hey are included in baptism, to whom all the promises of baptism belong.

But the promises of baptism belong to infants, Acts 7. 38, 39.

Mr. Ive's.

**I** Shall say nothing to this, but leave you to read over Acts 7. 38, 39. and consider if the least promise be made relating to baptism, in any of those verses. But I am apt to think you meant Acts 2. 38, 39. which is as little to your purpose, as the other; where the Apostle bids the *Jewes, Repent, and be baptized*;

tized; where note, That if their being *Abrahams* naturall seed would have given them a right to baptism, what need had they to have repented, in order to their baptism? He further saith, *That the promise is to them, and their Children.* To that I have formerly said, and proved, That in the Scripture Dialect many things may belong to a mans Children, that hath no respect to his infants, in the state of their infancy; for Christ tells the same people, *Mat. 23. 27. That he would have gathered their Children together, &c.* Can any man think that Christ here means their infants in the Cradle. In like manner the Apostle concludes, *That the promise was to them, and their Children,* he plainly shewes, that he did not mean their infants, but that Gods promises should be made good to their Children upon the same terms that they were to them, which was upon their Repentance, Faith, and Baptism; and therefore he afterwards urgeth, *That it was not onely to them and their Children, but to all that were afar off, even as many as the Lord our God should call.*

And now you conclude, and say,

Mr. Kellie.

**T**Hus much for the proof of infants baptism from Scripture precept.

Mr. Ives's.

**W**Hich if all the Scriptures you have urged, have any one Precept for infants Baptism, I shall leave to judgement.

You now come in the last place to prove infants baptism from Scripture practice, and your first, is,

Mr. Kellie.



Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat they were all, viz. the infants of the Israelites baptized to Moses, in the cloud, and in the sea, 1 Cor. 10. 2. Psal. 77. 17.

Mr. Ives.

**1** **W**hat's this to prove infants were baptized to Christ, if (one should grant) that in a sense they might be said to be baptized to Moses?

**2** How doth this saying, *They were baptized to Moses*, prove that infants were baptized to *Moses*? If you say, They were baptized to *Moses*, because they also came through the sea with their fathers: Then I demand in

The last place, whether a man may not as well say, That their Cattle were baptized to *Moses*, because they also came through the sea with *Moses*? Let him that's least among you judge if this Text proves that infants were baptized in water in the name of Jesus, because that infants came through the red sea with *Moses*.

Your second instance for the practice of infants baptism, is laid downe in a down right lame Argument, thus.

Mr. Kellie.

**T**he Apostles practised what they were to preach: But they were to preach all that Christ commanded, Mat. ult. ult. But Christ commanded that they should suffer little Children to come to him, and not to forbid them, that he might lay his hands on them, and blesse them: Therefore the Apostles practised this in suffering little Children to come to the Ordinance, and not forbidding them to that of baptism.

Mr. Ives.

*Mr. Iw's.*

**T**Ruly I could wish that this Argument had been born a little sooner, that so it might have been at *Oxford* or *Cambridge* the last Comencement, because it is in a new mood and figure that was never heard of before in any of the Schooles; it may be it might have purchased for you the good degree of a Prevaricator against the next year. But however, I fear a worse thing, that it is still born, and hath no strength in it.

For may you not as well say, That the Apostles in all ages were commanded to bring Asses to Christ, because when he was upon the earth he did Command them so to doe, because he had need of one, for so sayes the Text, *Mat. 21. 2, 3, 6.* as say that because Christ when he was in person upon the earth, did bid his Disciples to let infants come to him, that therefore this was part of their Commission when Christ left the earth.

But 2 May you not from hence as well command some of your Parish to goe and fetch you an Ass, and bring him to you, as you may from this Text injoyne them to bring their Children to you for baptism, because they were injoynd to come to Christ for a blessing. What Command is this to bring my Children to you, because Christ commanded them to be brought to him, any more then it is for me to bring my Horse or my Ass to you, because Christ commanded one should be brought to him? But if this be a good Argument to justifie infants baptism, I wonder that any Clergy-man of your opinion will goe one foot.

But more hath been spoken to this elsewhere, and  
I there-

fore I shall proceed to your third instance of the practice of infants baptism, and that is, say you,

Mr. Kellie.

**W**Hole Houses, Cities, and Families were baptized. And for proof hereof you cite Acts 8. 12. where the Text saith, *That when they believed Phillips preaching the things concerning the kingdome of God, they were baptized both men and women.*

Mr. Ives.

**W**Hat man would urge this Text (but he that was minded to quit the field of this controversy) to prove the Apostles baptized the *Samaritans* infants? You say the whole City of *Samaria* was baptized, therefore you would make us believe they baptized infants, when the Text saith no such thing, but that *They that RECEIVED THE WORD were baptized*, and not the whole City, as you would have it. Again, you urge.

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat the family of *Cornelius* and his near kindred were baptized, Acts 10. 24, 44, 48. And the household of *Stephanus*, 1 Cor. 1. 16. The *Jaylor*, and all his, Acts 2. 16. 13. And *Lydia* and her household, Acts 16. 15.

Mr. Ives.

**T**O the first of these I answer, That the Scripture no where saith that *Cornelius* had any infants baptized, but that those that *Heard Peters word*, and had received the Holy Ghost, and *spake with tongues*, and *glorified God*, Acts 10. 46, 47, 48. were baptized, which Text you urge for infants baptism. I shall appeale to all that shall seriously mind these words, whether there be any comparison between the persons baptized in that Text, and the infants that you baptize.

Next

Next you urge the household of *Stephanus*, that they were baptized, *1 Cor. 1. 16*. Hence you would infer infants were baptized. Now may not a man as well say, that because the Apostle saith, *1 Cor. 16. 15*. that *The house of Stephanus addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints*, that therefore infants in *Stephanus* house were addicted to minister to the Saints, as you may say, *Stephanus* his household were baptized, therefore infants in the house were baptized?

Your next is *Act. 16. 33*. where 'tis said, the Jaylor and all his were baptized: Now may not a man as well say, that his infants in the Cradle believed the Apostles, and that the Apostles preached to infants in the Cradle, as you may imagine that infants were baptized, because the Jaylor and all his were baptized? For the same Text that saith he and all his were baptized, doth also say, *That the Apostles spake unto him the word of the Lord, & to ALL that were in his house, vers. 32*. And *Vers. 34*. it is said, *That he (Viz. the Jaylor) believed in God with ALL his house*. And yet you presume to call this, as the rest *Scripture practice for infant-baptism*.

Your other instance is in the 15 Verse of the fore-cited Chapter, where we read that *Lydia* and her house were baptized, &c. You cannot from hence prove that *Lydia* was a married woman; for when women have husbands as the head of their families, the household is not usually known by the womans name. 2 If she had been married, how doe you prove she had any Children?

3 If she had had Children, how doe you prove she had any alive at this time; since it often times so falls out, that good people as well as bad may see

all their Children goe to the grave before them.

But 4. If she had Children alive, how doe you know but that the least of them were old enough to speak for themselves?

5 And lastly, if she had any infant Children, how can you infer from the Text that she baptized them? If you say, because her house was baptized; I answer, That a man may as well say, as I said before, that the infants of *Stephanus* did minister to the Saints, because the household of *Stephanus* did minister to the Saints. You doe urge severall Texts to shew that oftentimes in Scripture whole households doe include their infants, as *Gen. 14. 16. Judges 9. 16. 18. 1 Kings 17. 12, 13, 15. 1 Pet. 3. 21.* I shall not examine these Texts, whether you have urged them rightly, or no, because I agree with you, that oftentimes in Scripture, we must from severall reasons and circumstances conclude, that when it speaks of households, it includes infants: But if you cannot prove from any reason or circumstance in the Texts under debate, that it should here be so understood, then you have laboured all this while for that which satisfieth not; unlesse you will say, that alwayes when the Scripture speaks of house, or household, it intends little infants, which you will not say. And again, you may perceive by what hath been said, that in these houses those that were baptized have enough to distinguish them from being infants, to any that have not put out the eyes of their understanding.

You proceed, as though your conscience did convince you, that whatever you have talked of plain Scripture precept, and plain Scripture practice for infants



infants baptism, that there is no such thing in all the Scripture, because you say

Mr. Kellie.

**T**hat it is not expressed in the Scripture that women were admitted to breaking of bread, and yet (you say) we never question their right to that Ordinance, (You hereupon demand) why then should we question Childrens right to baptism?

Mr. Ives.

**I** Answer, First, that if we should doe a thing that we had no plain rule for, will this justifie you to doe evill, because we doe evill; and to walk in the dark without a plain rule, because we doe so.

But secondly, we have a plain rule for womens receiving the Lords Supper, 1 Cor. 11. 28. *Let a man examine himselfe*; where the word *examine* is of the Common Gender, and Beza renders it *quisq;* Which is as much as if the Apostle had said, Let EVERY ONE examin themselves, and so let them eat. Where have you such a plain Text as this for infants baptism?

Lastly, you urge, Col. 2. 11, 12. where you say;

Mr. Kellie.

**I**f that place doth not give Children a right to baptism, then the Apostle doth not write that which could satisfie either the Colossians, or the false Prophets that were for Circumcision. Your Reasons are, Because the false Prophets might have said, That the outward Circumcision of Children, did point and signifie the inward Circumcision of the heart: But if this be taken away, what have Children now to signifie the Circumcision of the heart?

Mr. Ives.

Mr. Iwe's.

SO then, by this you would give us to understand; that the false Prophets could no way be answered unlesse the Apostle had granted baptism of infants, to signifie that which Circumcision did before. To this I answer, That if Circumcision had signified the Circumcising of infants hearts, then the false Prophets might have pleaded thus, But I deny that it signified any such thing to or of infants: And therefore you said well when you said, The FALSE Prophets might say so, but I am sure no true Prophet ever said so.

And again, If the question had been about infants baptism, he could not have spoken that which had satisfied either the *Colossians*, or false Teachers, if he had not conformed his Answer thereto. But there is not the least noise of such a thing in the Text, as you or any body else that shall but view it, may perceive; for the Apostle sayes, *Vers. 11. That they were circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, &c.* Doth not this plainly shew, that he doth strengthen the *Colossians* from returning to the beggerly Rudiments of the world, by the benefit which they received by putting off the sins of the flesh, which they could not obtain by cutting their flesh in Circumcision. And now he tells them not onely the Argument of their being converted from sin, and made compleat in Christ, should strengthen them from falling back to the Rudiments of the Law; but also, *Vers. 12.* their being buried with Christ in baptism, and their rising with him in baptism, through the faith of the operation of God, should so far ingage them in the Christian

Christian Religion, that all the Philosophicall deceits of men should never be able to turn them from it : And where is so much as one word to your purpose? I must needs say, That out of all the Texts you have prest, I cannot see water enough to sprinkle upon the face of one Child.

And whereas you tell me,

Mr. Kellie.

**I** Might have saved you this labour, and my selfe too, if I had minded the Books of Dr. Featly, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Gerce, Mr. Church, Mr. Cobbet, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Blake, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Sidenham, besides many other excellent men who have written in Latine, as Hostius, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, and all the best lights in the Christian world full and clear against me.

Mr. Iwe's.

**T**O this I Answer, That you might have saved me a labour, if you had found out of all your Observations of these men, but one plain Command or example for infants baptism, and given it me at your house, or sent it in your Paper, which makes me think, that either these men have said as little to the purpose as you, or else that you have minded them but a little, because you otherwise would have said more to the purpose, then I doe perceive you have done.

But I have not lived without some observations of (if not all, yet) many of these mens works; for I have not as yet taken up any Opinion wherein I differ from you, or others, but I have seriously weighed it in the ballance of the Sanctuary : And I have not declined the way of these men your name, nor any other, but when (I have upon serious examination

mination found ) that they have declined the footsteps of the Primitive Purity, either in Doctrine or Discipline.

And whereas you talk of learned men, and fathers, and best Lights in the Christian world, that they are all against me; I tell you, that if God and his word be for me, I care not who is against me: And I tell you further, that I had rather have one Testimony from the word of God for my practice, than ten thousand of these Authors without it.

**I** Shall therefore shew you

1 Plain Scripture Proof for believers baptism.

2 Plain Example for it.

3 Plain Command and Example for the manner of the Administration of it.

4 And lastly, That the footsteps hereof ( since you talk of learned and godly men ) was not wholly defaced in the three first Centuries after the Apostles, nor then neither. Nay, a man may make a shift to know this was the practice, by those relicks of it that remained in the Church of *England*, till the memory of man.

That Christ our Lord Commands this, who we must hear in all things, or else we shall be destroyed, appears first from *Mat. 28. 19. Teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* Which most of your own Authors doe acknowledge \* (as I have shewed) should be read, *Make Disciples, baptizing THEM*, and not the Nations, as you would sometimes have it: Though at your house you granted the Text ought to be so Translated, as I have now rendred it; therefore you proceeded from hence to prove infants Disciples, which

\* See Mr. Baxter in his plain Scripture proof for Infants baptism. p. 15.

## Believers-Baptism proved.

65

which you could not have done, but by granting what I have said.

The next Text is, *Mark 16. 16.* He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; &c. *Acts 10. 48.* And he (*viz.* the Apostle) commanded them to be baptized with water (who were converted by his Preaching) in the name of the Lord Jesus. *Mark 1. 4.* John did preach the baptism of repentance, which could not be infants baptism, *Acts 2. 38.* Peter said, Repent and be baptized every one of you. *Acts 22. 16.* Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.

Secondly, We have plenty of Example of this in the Scripture, *Rom. 6. 4.* We (*viz.* believing Christians) are buried with him in baptism. *Mat. 3. 6.* They were all baptized of John in Jordan, confessing their sins. *Mark 1. 9.* Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan. *Mat. 3. 15.* *Acts 2. 41.* Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized, &c. *Acts 8. 12.* When they did believe Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, they were baptized both men and women. *Acts 8. 38.* when the Eunuch profess faith. *Verf. 37.* he said, *Verf. 38.* that Philip baptized him. *Acts 9. 18.* Saul, when he was converted, the Text saith, He arose and was baptized. The Jaylor, *Acts 16. 33.* when he and his house believed, the Text saith, He and all his were baptized. *Acts 18. 8.* And Crispus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue believed on the Lord with all his house. And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. *Acts 19. 5.* When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Thirdly, Command and Example in plain words for the manner of it, which was by dipping the person all over in the water, and not by sprinkling wa-



ter upon the face, as the manner of the Nation is; This appears by the Command, *Make Disciples* (for so it must be read) of all Nations, dipping them into the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit; for that is the English signification of the word: And I desire you to shew me where baptizo signifies aspersio in all the Bible. And the like Command you have, *Mark* 16. 16. But that you may know that dipping and not sprinkling, was the Command of Christ, and the Practice of the Primitive times, however it is now laughed at, appears by the Practice of Christ himself, *Mat.* 16. 3. *Jesus when he was baptized went UP OUT of the water, &c.* *Mark* 1. 5. *They were all baptized of him in the River Jordan, &c.* *John* 2. 23. *John was baptized in Enon near to Salim, because there was Much water there, and They Came and were baptized.* *Acts* 8. 38, 39. 'tis said, *Vers.* 38. that *Thy (viz. Philip and the Eunuch)* went both downe into the water: And when Philip had baptized him, it is said, *Vers.* 39. *That they came out of the water.* I shall appeale to all unbiassed men, whether baptizing men and women in Rivers, upon their professing faith in Christ, doth not better accord with these Scriptures, then sprinkling water upon the face of infants.

Besides, Fourthly, This was the Practice of the Church long after the Apostles, as appears first by what

*Socrater Scholasticus* in his Ecclesiasticall History reports of *Constantine* the Great, That though he was the Son of *Hellena* a zealous Professor of *Chriſt*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. yet he was not baptized till he was 65 years old, which was after he had left *Constantinople*, and *Helenopolis*, and came to *Nicomedia* where dwelling

dwelling in a Mannor without the Town-walls, he was baptized into the faith of Christ, in which baptism he greatly rejoiced, *lib. 1. cap. 26.*

Again, the same Author saith, That in *Alexandria* the Holy Scriptures were read and interpreted by the UNBAPTIZED, which he calls *Catechumens*, as well as by them that were baptized; which (saith he) was contrary to the Customs of other Countries and Churches, who did not suffer any to do so till they were baptized, *Socrates, lib. 3. cap. 21.* Which plainly shewes, that infants baptism was not a Tradition of the Apostles; for if it had, this Church of *Alexandria*, that had for the space of some hundred years been converted to the faith of Christ, would by this time (if all believers had baptized their infants, as the Church of *England*, and others, doe now adayes, one Generation after another) have been without any that were able to read and interpret the Scriptures before baptism, as we see the Nation of *Engl.* now is, a few (*Anabaptists* Children so called) excepted; otherwise where are your *Catechumens* that are able to read & understand the holy Scriptures before you baptize them? And that they in those times did follow the way of Christ in baptizing, and not your *Balon* way, appears; for the same *Socrates, lib. 7. cap. 4.* speaks of a Jew which was baptized by *Sosius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, who saith he, as soon as he was **TAKEN OUT OF THE WATER**, his *Passe* left him. Can it be said so of any that you baptize, that they are taken out of the water?

The same Author further saith, *lib. 7. cap. 17.* of a Jew that was to be baptized upon his profession of faith, by *Paulus* the *Novatian* Bishop; that all things were

were provided for his baptism, among which he saith *The Bishop did provide him a linnen Garment*, which was to no purpose if he had not been to dip the person in water. And *Belarmius* himself acknowledges, that in old time they had women in the Church, whom they called to the Office of Deaconesses, to attend upon the women that were baptized, with baptizing cloaths.

And *Jerome* Translating the Lamentation of *Origen*, saith, *That Origen lamented and bewailed the vow that [HE MADE WHEN HE WAS BAPTIZED,] in that he had now by sin walked contrary to it.* However *Origen* is himself thought to favour this practice afterwards, yet those things are but the supposed works of *Origen*, and it's hard to say whether it was his or no.

Again, *Eusebius* who writ the Ecclesiasticall History of the first 300 years after Christ, though he tells us of all the most observable passages of those times, yet he doth not so much as mention the baptizing of one infant, but doth often times mention things in favour to the baptizing of men, upon profession of faith; as appears *lib. 7. cap. 8.* of his Ecclesiasticall story, where he relates of a man that heard the Questions that was by the Minister asked of persons to be baptized, and [THEIR ANSWERS TO THEM,] fell down and wept at the Ministers feet, because the baptism that he had received of the Hereticks, was not like the baptism [THAT WAS IN USE THEN,] which plainly sheweth, That at this time the Churches did not receive men to baptism, but upon profession of faith, and also that it was no Apostolicall Custome to baptize infants. Further, *Beza* himself upon *Acts 17. 3.* saith, *That they*

they professed in baptism the doctrine propounded by John. And besides this, how often have Mr. Tombs, and Mr. Den, and others, produced sufficient proof that this practice of baptizing infants, was not so much the Custom of the Primitive times, as y<sup>e</sup> u imagine.

That memorable instance of Gregory Nazianzen, whose father was a Bishop, and his mother a virtuous woman, yet himselfe was not baptized till he came from Athens, where (as Socrates saith, lib. 4. cap. 21.) he had spent much of his time in the study of Rhetorick.

Again, That other instance of Mr. Tombs out of Hugo Grotius, in his Annotations upon Mat. 19. 14. That even Chrysostome, though born of Christian parents, was not baptized till he was 21 years of age. The same Grotius adds, That the Canon of the Synod of Neocesarea held in the year 315, determined that a woman with Child might be baptized, because baptism did not reach the fruit of her womb, because in the confession made in baptism, **EVERY ONES FREE CHOICE IS SHEWED.** He adds further, That many of the Greeks to his time did defer the baptizing little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith.

Again, Was not the Image of this Custom to be seen in the practice of the Church of England, when they asked, What was required of persons **TO BE BAPTIZED**, and the answer was, Repentance whereby they forsake sin, and Faith whereby they believe the Promises of God: Which afterwards by changing the Command of God into a Tradition of their owne, they did use to ask the God-fathers and God-mothers, a conceit that was never heard of till the Churches had apostatized from their Primitive Purity.



*Believers-Baptism proved.*

And as for the manner of baptizing, by dipping the Person in the water, however it is now laught at, you see it was not onely that which as I have said, Christ and his Apostles Commanded and Practiced, but it was used in the Church for a long time after; & the Church of *England* did look upon it as a more commendable way, in as much as they in their Service-Book did place *dipping* before *sprinkling*, and therefore they said, the persons **DIPPED**, or *sprinkled*, &c. Now may I not better say, That if you had looked over the Command of Christ, and the Practice of the Apostle, and traced the foot-steps of the Primitive Practice in this Point, for 300 years after, you might have saved me a labour, and your self too, then you could say, I might have saved you a labour if I had looked over the writings of a few men that you have named, who have not in all their Books cited either a Command or Example for infants sprinkling, but onely some far-fetched *non-sequitors*, which most of your Paper is filled withall.

I shall now conclude, leaving what I have said in Answer to your Arguments for your Practice, and the plain Scripture I have urged for my own Practice, to your judgement, and the judgement of all to whom this shall come, and desire that like the *Bereans*, you and all others that shall peruse this, would search whether what I have said in the premises, be of God, or no; and if in your Conscience you or any else doe so find it to be, take heed then what you do in opposing of it, least you be found fighters against God. And what hath fallen from my pen that is not according to Gods word, I shall desire that you



*Believers-Baptism proved.*

or any else would shew it me, either in word or writing, and it shall thankfully be received as a favour, by

*S I R,*

*Your Friend to*

*Serve you.*

*J B R: I V E S.*

*F I N I S.*